

Links to Evidence

Dr David Evans (david.evans@sciencespeak.com)

24 July 2008, Revised 9 Sept 2008

Introduction

This is a brief list of links to evidence behind the four points I made in each of two articles:

1. Friday 18 July 2008 in *The Australian* newspaper,
www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,24036736-7583,00.html.
2. 12 August 2008 at OpenForum.com,
<http://www.openforum.com.au/content/global-warming-science-moves>.

1. The Greenhouse Signature is Missing

A simple briefing that draws its data from documents from the two most authoritative alarmist sources, the IPCC and the US CCSP:

<http://sciencespeak.com/MissingSignature.pdf>.

2. There is No Evidence That Carbon Emissions Caused the Recent Global Warming

For the notable lack of evidence that carbon emissions causes global warming, you might look through the relevant chapter of the latest assessment report from the IPCC (AR4, 2007)

ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/Report/AR4WG1_Print_Ch09.pdf

and note that you cannot actually find any. Since the articles above were published, a couple of items have been offered as evidence:

- “CO₂ has been proved to be a greenhouse gas in laboratory experiments”. True, but it doesn’t say anything about how much CO₂ contributes to the temperature differential between the top of the atmosphere and the surface, or what effect increasing the CO₂ concentration in a real atmosphere with feedbacks, water vapour and clouds, saturated absorption CO₂ frequencies, convection, dust, plants and oceans. Because it doesn’t even begin to say how much the global temperature changes for a given change in CO₂ concentration, those laboratory observations are not evidence that increased CO₂ concentrations are the main cause of the recent global warming.

- “Recent observed temperature increases are as predicted by models.” First, that is not evidence because it is a comparison to models, and at best could only show that the models were right in that instance. While this might help raise our confidence in the models, we know the models cannot get close to the truth because they are very inadequate in modelling clouds, plants and dust, and make no attempt at all to include solar-magnetic effects. Second, none of the IPCC models predicted the temperature flattening that has occurred since 2001, so they were all wrong.

So we are left with only theoretical reasons for supposing that CO₂ is having a significant effect on global temperatures. But theoretical calculations differ, by very wide margins. If you are feeling ambitious you might look at these two calculations. Both demonstrate that the expected temperature rise in the event that the concentration of atmospheric carbon doubles (which will happen on current trends around 2100 AD) is around 0.3°C — only 10% of the 3.2°C that the IPCC predicts.

- www.aps.org/units/fps/newsletters/200807/monckton.cfm. Some parts of this paper are written at a level of 1st year physics, but even if the calculations are too tough to follow there is a lot of non-mathematical material that might give you some insights into the theoretical problems with the IPCC case. This paper is sort of peer reviewed—it was written by a journalist and its status is a bit controversial.
- met.hu/doc/idojaras/vol111001_01.pdf. This was produced by a NASA mathematician, and contains high level maths and physics. It is the first detailed calculation of the expected temperature increase that goes to the trouble of solving the problem using a realistic atmosphere. He gets a temperature increase for carbon doubling of 0.24°C (page 22), which is much lower than the 3°C that NASA previously calculated by assuming that the atmosphere went up forever. It makes the problem much easier mathematically if you pretend the atmosphere is of infinite height, but it turns out this made a huge difference to the answer—who would have guessed? And yes, it is peer reviewed.

3. Global Temperatures Stopped Rising in 2001

There are four bodies around the world that produce global temperature records. Go to any and all of the following data records, and note the trend from 1979 (when satellite data started) to the present. Then put your hand over the data prior to 2001 and notice the trend for the last seven years.

- Remote Sensing Systems in California. Uses only satellite data: www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/RSSglobe.html.
- University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH). Uses only satellite data: www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/UAHMSUglobe.html.
- The Hadley Centre in the UK uses a mix of satellite data and land based thermometers: www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/HadCRUG.html.

- The Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) at NASA uses land thermometers (plus a few ocean thermometers), but not satellite data (oddly enough, for NASA): www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/GISSglobal.html.

Three of the four global temperature records use satellite data either partly or exclusively. Satellite data is the only temperature data we can trust, but it only goes back to 1979. The satellites go around 24/7, measuring the temperature across broad swathes of the world, everywhere except the poles.

Land based thermometers are used exclusively by one record (the record the IPCC prefers to quote, because it shows more warming), and partly one by other record. Land based thermometer readings are corrupted by the urban heat island effect—they show that temperatures rising faster in areas with higher populations. To get a graphic idea of why, see www.surfacestations.org/odd_sites.htm or wattsupwiththat.wordpress.com/test/.

JunkScience (despite their name) do a good factual coverage of temperature data: www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/Warming_Look.html.

4. New Ice Core Data

There is lots of stuff on the web on the 800 year lag of carbon behind temperatures in the ice cores, but no single value-free data source. Maybe look at the abstract of the single most significant paper, which came out in 2003:

icebubbles.ucsd.edu/Publications/CaillonTermIII.pdf

This is easier to read, but its diagram is lost in the mists of web decay:

www.noe21.org/dvd2/Global%20Warming%20FAQ%20-%A0%20temperature.htm.

And here is a colourful but informative and link-filled discussion of the ice-core issue:

motls.blogspot.com/2006/07/carbon-dioxide-and-temperatures-ice.html.

Al Gore suggested in his movie that “the more CO₂, the warmer the temperatures”. He made his movie in 2005, but clearly the evidence showed nothing of the kind by 2003.